

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR 10/774,780 02/09/2004 Gregory D. Aviza 00216-674001 / Case 8144 8854 26161 **EXAMINER** 7590 04/25/2005 FISH & RICHARDSON PC PETERSON, KENNETH E 225 FRANKLIN ST ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER BOSTON, MA 02110 3724

DATE MAILED: 04/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			. •
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	10/774,780	AVIZA, GREGORY	D.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenneth E Peterson	3724	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with	he correspondence addi	ress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repit NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statution Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS te, cause the application to become ABANI	be timely filed O) days will be considered timely. Forom the mailing date of this com DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	munication.
Status	•	•	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ Thi	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allows closed in accordance with the practice under			nerits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1-28 are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ac	cepted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		` '	,
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E		-	• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applority documents have been recau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ication No ceived in this National St	age
Attachment(s)			
) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Sumr	nary (PTO-413)	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		ail Date nal Patent Application (PTO-1	52)

Application/Control Number: 10/774,780 Page 2

Art Unit: 3724

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 2-5, drawn to a razor having blade support slots.
- II. Claims 6 and 7, drawn to a razor having elongate blade support portions.
- III. Claim 13, drawn to a razor having blades positioned in a plane.
- IV. Claim 14 and 26, drawn to a razor having elongate blade snap-fits.
- V. Claim 16-21,24 and 25, drawn to a razor having blade with adjustable stops.
- 2. Claims 1,8,15,22 and 23 will be examined with the election of any of groups I-V. One of claims 9-12 will be examined with the election of any of groups I-V, depending on which species is elected. Also, one of claims 27 and 28 will be examined with the election of any of groups I-V, depending on which species is elected.
- 3. Claim 1 links the inventions of group I-V. The restriction requirement of the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim, claim 1.

Claim 22 links the inventions of group IV-V. The restriction requirement of the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim, claim 22.

Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are

Application/Control Number: 10/774,780

Art Unit: 3724

presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

Page 3

- 4. Inventions of group I-V are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. For example, the razor having blade support slots of group I could utilize free-span blades, as opposed to the blade supports of group II. Conversely, the razor using blade supports of group II could fasten the blades to flanges instead of in the slots of group I. Further example can be provided if needed. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
- 5. There is an excessive burden on the office to examine all of these inventions together, as shown by their search. See MPEP 808.02(C). For example, the razor of group I would be searched in class 30, subclass 48 along with a unique text search for slots. The razor of group II would not be searched as above, but would instead be searched in class 30, subclass 75 along with a different text search. The other groups also have unique searches, and additional examples can be provided if needed.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/774,780

Art Unit: 3724

- 6. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different search and because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 7. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species A - 2 blades raised into the recess.

Species B-3 blades raised into the recess.

Species C – 4 blades raised into the recess.

Species D-5 blades raised into the recess.

Species E-2 blades lowered into the recess.

Species F – 3 blades lowered into the recess.

Species G – 4 blades lowered into the recess.

Species H – 5 blades lowered into the recess.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, many of the claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim

is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Page 5

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- 8. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ken Peterson at 571-272-4512, on Monday-Thursday, 7AM-5PM.

Art Unit: 3724

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap, can be reached at 571-272-4514. In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that papers be faxed to 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov or call the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

kp April 13, 2005

> KENNETH E. PETERSON PRIMARY EXAMINER